REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application, as evidenced by the first Official Action. The first Official Action rejects Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 20-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by PCT Application No. WO 99/56431 to Hansen et al.; and rejects the remaining claims, namely Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,123 to Chapman. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Hansen and Chapman, taken individually or in combination; and accordingly, traverse the aforementioned rejections of the claims. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended various ones of the claims to further clarify the claimed invention, including amending independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 to include the subject matter of Claims 2 and 3, 9 and 10, 16 and 17, and 23 and 24, respectively; and including canceling Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, 23 and 24. In addition, Applicants have added new Claims 29-32 to claim further aspects of the present invention. In view of the amendments to the claims, the added claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

A.   *Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 20-26 and 28 are Patentable*

Briefly, Hansen discloses a communication terminal that forwards a data request to a server. As disclosed, the request comprises an identification of the requested data and a communication terminal identification number provided to the server. In this regard, the server recalls stored data format information associated with the communication terminal identification number. Chapman discloses a packet network that supports packet header suppression. As disclosed, suppressed packet headers are appended with stored headers after they are received by a receiving node.

According to one aspect of the present invention, as reflected by amended independent Claim 1, a method is recited that includes receiving a resource request for a resource at a network entity, where the resource request includes a group header identifier. The method also includes identifying at least one header field associated with the group header identifier at the network

entity, and processing the resource request in accordance with the header field(s) associated with the group header identifier. As amended, and formerly recited by dependent Claims 2 and 3, the method further includes associating the header field(s) with the group header identifier before receiving the resource request for the resource. In this regard, associating the header field(s) with the group header includes receiving an earlier request at the network entity from a terminal, where the earlier request includes at least one header field and a call for associating the header field(s) with a group header identifier; associating the header field(s) with a group header identifier; and sending the group header identifier to the terminal.

In contrast to amended independent Claim 1, Hansen (as well as Chapman) does not teach or suggest the terminal sending <u>a request including a call</u> for associating one or more header fields with a group header identifier. Addressing this feature of former dependent Claim 3, the first Official Action cites page 10, line 29 – page 11, line 2 of Hansen for allegedly disclosing the feature. At best, one could argue that the cited passage of Hansen discloses that when a terminal initiates a communication session with a server, the server may store a cookie with session headers referenced to a terminal identification number, which the terminal may use in requesting data from the server during the session. Even in such an instance, however, Hansen does not teach or suggest that any request from the terminal includes, in addition to any session headers, a specific call to associate those headers with a terminal identification number, similar to amended independent Claim 1.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 4-7 and 29, is patentably distinct from Hansen. Applicants also respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 8, 15 and 22 recite subject matter similar to that of amended independent Claim 1, including a request from a terminal including a call to associate header(s) with a group header identifier. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 8, 15 and 22, and by dependency Claims 11-14, 18-21, 25-28 and 30-32, are also patentably distinct from Hansen for at least the same reasons given above with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

In addition to the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that various ones of dependent Claims 4-7, 11-14, 18-21, 25-28 and 29-32 recite features further patentably distinct

from Hansen. Examples of such features are explained below with respect to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly Claims 11, 18 and 25) and dependent Claim 29 (and similarly Claims 30-32).

1. Dependent Claims 4, 11, 18 and 25

Amended dependent Claim 4 (and similarly amended dependent Claims 11, 18 and 25) further recites receiving a subsequent request at the network entity from the terminal, where the subsequent request includes the group header identifier and an alternative at least one header field; and overwriting the header field(s) associated with the group header identifier to thereby associate the alternative header field(s) with the group header identifier. These features are also absent from Hansen (as well as Chapman). In addressing the features of dependent Claim 4, the Official Action cites page 10, lines 13-19 of Hansen for allegedly disclosing the feature. The cited passage of Hansen, however, merely discloses the server storing user profile information, or recalling stored user profile information based on a terminal identification number, in responding to data request from a terminal. This passage, and Hansen in general, do not teach or suggest that any headers associated with the terminal identification number may be replaced with alternative headers in a subsequent request including the identification number and those alternative headers, similar to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly amended dependent Claims 11, 18 and 25).

2. Dependent Claims 29-32

New dependent Claim 29 (and similarly new dependent Claims 30-32) recites that the header field(s) and respective value(s) and with a group header identifier. The method, then, further includes receiving a subsequent request at the network entity from the terminal, where the subsequent request includes the group header identifier and at least one associated header field with an alternative at least one respective value. In addition, the method includes overwriting the value(s) of the header field(s) associated with the group header identifier to thereby associate the header field(s) and the alternative respective value(s) with the group header identifier. These features are also absent from Hansen (as well as Chapman). Just as Hansen does not teach or suggest replacing any headers associated with a terminal identification number with any

alternative headers, Hansen also does not teach or suggest replacing the values of any headers associated with a terminal identification number with any alternative values, similar to dependent Claim 29 (and similarly amended dependent Claims 30-32).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 20-26 and 28 as being anticipated by Hansen is overcome.

B.   *Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 are Patentable*

The first Official Action rejects Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Chapman. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Chapman does not cure the defects of Hansen. That is, even considering Chapman, neither Hansen nor Chapman, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest sending a request including a call for associating one or more header fields with a group header identifier, similar to the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Hansen and Chapman, taken individually or in any combination. And for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 6, 13, 20 and 27 as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Chapman is overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the claims, the added claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30532407v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON OCTOBER 5, 2007.